

Cities of Heraclius

THOMAS S. BROWN, ANTHONY BRYER
and DAVID WINFIELD

The Hellenistic and Roman passion for founding, or renaming, Eastern cities in honour of their rulers abated only with the decline of urban life itself under the Byzantines, although it was never entirely forgotten.¹ The last notable example seems to be the tragi-comic career of Tralles (Aydin) as Andronikopolis or Palaiologopolis in 1278–82.² But the last emperor to have notably bestowed his (or his family's) name on cities with the old gusto seems to have been Heraclius. It was perhaps part of a recognizable pattern of traits—the complex naming of his sons, the family groups on his coins, the concern for his own title,³ the quest for the True Cross, and the style of his victory despatch from Nineveh—in which one may glimpse in Heraclius a relentless and self-conscious sense of dynasty and historicity.

Our offering to Sir Steven Runciman concerns three cities of Heraclius, renamed in, or after, his reign: (1) Herakleioupolis (now Beduhtun), where we argue that he did *not* winter in 625; (2) Herakleia (now Arakli), where we suggest that Heraclius (II) (Heraclonas) was born in 626; and (3) *Heracliana civitas* (a forerunner of Venice), which we propose was not named in Heraclius' honour until centuries after his death. Anthony Bryer

1. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602* (Oxford, 1964), II, p. 719; III, pp. 226–7, n. 16; D. Claude, *Die Byzantinische Stadt im 6. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1969), pp. 204–6.

2. George Pachymeres, *De Michaelē et Andronico Palaeologis* (CSHB), I, pp. 468–74; Nicephorus Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia* (CSHB), I, pp. 142–4; D. M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453* (London, 1972), pp. 91–2.

3. On this title, see I. Shahid, 'The Iranian factor in Byzantium during the reign of Heraclius', *DOP*, XXVI (1972), 293–320.

is responsible for Sections I and II, and T. S. Brown for Section III, but to David Winfield falls the distinction of having discovered and identified the Herakleia first published in Section II.

I

Where was Heraclius in 625? The case of Herakleioupolis

In 'A Chronological Note on the First Persian Campaign of Heraclius',⁴ N. Oikonomides extracted a firm date from George of Pisidia's nebulous poem on the subject: that of the lunar eclipse of 28 July 622, which so discomforted the Persians in the Pontos. Oikonomides left Heraclius back in Constantinople and his army wintering, perhaps 'in Armenia'. Quite how, in these obscure years, Heraclius organized a new army 'in the region of the themes'⁵—we forbear to comment on Theophanes' notorious phrase—remains in dispute. But his movements, although equally ill-documented, were on the firmer ground of Antolia. He stood midway between the vestiges of the late Roman defence system, the *Itineraria* and *Notitia Dignitatum* of the past, and the beginnings of the Byzantine defence system and Constantine Porphyrogenitus' list of *aplekta* (Byzantine military assembly fields) of the future. Even if neither type of source can help elucidate Heraclius' military administration, geography dictates that either, or both, should provide parallels for his invasion and supply routes, and assembly and strong points. For example, Heraclius opened his first Persian campaign on 6 April 622 by landing at Pylai (?Gömlek), on the Gulf of Nikomedeia (Izmit), so initiating what was to become one of the commonest Byzantine military entry points to Anatolia.⁶ Logically it would lead to Theodosioupolis (Karin, now Erzurum), *via* Dorylaion

4. *BMGS*, I (1975), 1–9.

5. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, I (Leipzig, 1883; reprinted Hildesheim, 1963), p. 303; on which see now N. Oikonomides 'Les premières mentions des thèmes dans la chronique de Théophane', *ZRVI*, XVI (1975), 1–8.

6. Hitherto Helenopolis seems to have been favoured; later the First Crusaders used Kibotos. Most references in W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890; reprinted Amsterdam, 1962), pp. 187, 201, 211, 352 n. Pylai could be no more than the military port of Helenopolis (cf. Procopius, *Anecdota*, XXX, 8), but is not recorded before 622.

(Eskişehir) and Bathys Rhyax, among other *aplekta*; the destination of Caesarea (Kayseri), suggested by Oikonomides, would equally be in order.

Heraclius may have opened his second Persian campaign on 25 March 623.⁷ This time, he and his empress Martina began at Nikomedeia, only 70 km. by water from Pylai, but offering a new series of routes which, logically, would have led to the old Roman base of Satala (Sadak) via the future *aplektion* of Dazimon.

7. The sources, which are of the sort which fall into pieces in the hand, are, in more or less chronological order of compilation: George of Pisidia, *Poemi, I. Panegirici epici*, ed. A. Pertusi (Ettal, 1959), esp. pp. 109, 129, 188–9, who was an eyewitness of the 622 campaign, but there are no eyewitness accounts of the remaining Persian campaigns: *Chronicon Paschale (CSHB)*, I, pp. 714–26; Antiochus Strategus, monk of St. Sabas, *La prise de Jérusalem par les Perses en 614*, ed. G. Garitte (CSCO, CCII–CCIII, Louvain, 1960) (Georgian), *Expugnationis Hierosolymae A.D. 614*, ed. G. Garitte (CSCO, CCCLX–CCCLXI, Louvain, 1973) (Arabic), and F. C. Conybeare, ‘Antiochus Strategos’ Account of the Sack of Jerusalem in A.D. 614’, *EHR*, XXV (1910), 502–17 (incomplete English trans.); *Histoire d’Héraclius par l’évêque Sebeôs*, trans. F. Macler (Paris, 1904), esp. pp. 62, 80–84 (Armenian); *In hymnum Acatistum*, MPG, CXII, 1349; Theophanes, *Chronographia* I, esp. pp. 302–7; Nicephorus, Archbishop of Constantinople, *Opuscula Historica*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1904), esp. p. 15; George the Monk, *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, II (Leipzig, 1904), esp. p. 670; Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria, *Annales, pars posterior*, ed. L. Cheikho (Beirut and Paris, 1909), esp. pp. 2, 12 (Arabic), and MPG, CXI, 1087–88 (Latin trans.); Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia (CSHB)*, esp. pp. 150–1; *The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movṣēs Daxuranci*, trans. C. J. F. Dowsett (London, 1961), esp. pp. 78–87 (Armenian); M. G. Djanishvili, *Sbornik Materialov diia opisaniia i plemen Kavkaze*, XVII (Tbilisi, 1900), esp. pp. 17, 44–5, now best approached through M. Van Esbroeck, ‘Une chronique de Maurice à Héraclius dans un récit des sièges de Constantinople,’ *Bedi Kartlisa*, XXXIV (1976), 74–96, esp. 82, 93 (Georgian) and the Georgian Annals, trans. M. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, I [St. Petersburg, 1849], esp. p. 229; cf. C. Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* [Georgetown, 1973], pp. 390–3; and George Cedrenus, *Historiarum Compendium (CSHB)*, esp. pp. 719–20. Theophanes and Leo Grammaticus use George of Pisidia and Cedrenus uses George the Monk; only Theophanes (p. 134) is at all specific about where Heraclius wintered in 625; in 626 those mentioning the birth of Heraclius (II) (Heraclonas) include Nicephorus (d. 829) and the Georgian. Older analyses of this farrago include L. Drapeyron, *L’empereur Héraclius et l’empire byzantin au VIIe siècle* (Paris, 1869), pp. 131–286; and A. Pernice, *L’imperatore Eraclio* (Florence, 1905), pp. 111–82. An excellent recent account, which identifies on the ground the havoc caused by the Persians, is C. Foss, ‘The Persians in Asia Minor and the end of Antiquity’, *EHR*, CCCLVII (1975), 721–47.

The fact that Heraclius went to Theodosiupolis instead—therefore probably crossing the Halys (Kizil Irmak) at Sebasteia (Sivas)—is not, however, surprising. He did not have Ramsay with him. The northern road systems run close and, at one crucial point, Bathys Rhyax (on the Pylai–Theodosiupolis route) and Dazimon (on the Nikomediea–Satala route), lie only 55 km. apart. From Theodosiupolis, Manandjan has led Heraclius’ army along Peutinger routes all over Armenia.⁸ Winter 625 brought Heraclius west again, safe into untroubled Pontos. Theophanes specifies that he passed through Sebasteia and wintered on the other side of the Halys.⁹

North and west of Sebasteia, on the other side of the Halys, two tributaries of the river form connected valley plains in the shape of a letter Y. The modern Cebilirmak (formerly Yildizirmak) reaches 48 km. north to Pedachthoe (now Beduhtun), and the modern Kalinirmak stretches west to modern Yildizeli (formerly Yenihan), 37 km. from Sebasteia.

Pedachthoe stands above the end of the valley at over 1515 m., and below the modern Yildiz Dağ, a striking conical mountain of 2537 m., which can be snow-bound in mid-May. Hagiography and epigraphy reveal that Pedachthoe was a monastic settlement serving pilgrims to the mountain, which was sacred and peopled with ascetics of both sexes. One local cult was unusual, even by Pontic standards. Every 17 July, the feast of St. Athenogenes, a hind would enter Pedachthoe church, escorting a fawn, while the gospel was being read. The hind was the descendant of a deer befriended by St. Athenogenes, *chorepiskopos* in the place and victim of Diocletian. The fawn she brought was annually sacrificed and eaten in commemoration of the martyr. Bollandists were sceptical of the tale, but (equally predictably) it fascinated Franz Cumont, who related it to a pagan past and to the midsummer rites of his own day on the Yildiz Dağ, a mountain of stars.¹⁰

8. Ja. A. Manandjan, ‘Maršruty persidskikh pohodov imperatora Iraklija’, *VI, III* (1950), 133–53.

9. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, p. 314.

10. F. Cumont, ‘L’archevêché de Pédachtoé et le sacrifice du Faon’, *B*, VI (1931), 521–33; the same and E. Cumont, ‘Voyage d’exploration archéologique dans le Pont et la Petite Arménie’, *Studia Pontica*, II (Brussels, 1906), 233; *AASS*, July, IV, p. 219; *Synaxarium CP*, cols. 825–6.

One would be hard put to link such a place and such goings-on with Heraclius if Pedachthoe had not been awarded, out of the blue, an autocephalous archbishopric before 640 (represented at the Councils of 681 and 787), together with a new name: *Ἡρακλειούπολις*.¹¹ As early as 1740, LeQuien drew the obvious conclusion that the *‘Civitas fuit ab Heraclio imperatore appellata quo tempore adversus Persas bellum gerebat’*.¹² But Cumont and Laurent did not think twice when they carried the argument a stage further, by making Heraclius not only establish the archbishopric and rename the place in 625, but winter his army there too.¹³ Pedachthoe’s real claim to elevation was surely as guardian of a monastic mountain. It is hardly, even by Byzantine standards, a *polis*, and is the last place on which to winter an army. Like so many myth-bound and numinous regions, the caves and retreats of the high, cold Yildiz Dağ are attractive to ascetics because they are frankly inconvenient to those on secular business. Heraclius had every reason to go to Herakleioupolis as a pilgrim (and evidently did so), and none as a general seeking winter quarters. But Herakleioupolis is surely the clue to where Heraclius *did* winter, for it lay close to what was to be one of the great Byzantine *aplekta*: the elusive Bathys Rhyax.

Winter quarters and spring *aplekta* are, for obvious reasons, neither in cities (although usually within reach of one), nor on bare mountains like the Yildiz Dağ. They require good communications, low winter grazing or well-watered pastures in the hotter seasons, over an extensive area. A good Turkish example is the Yassi Çimen of Erzincan.¹⁴ A good Byzantine example is Dazimon, an area (not a place) name—Strabo’s

11. H. Gelzer, *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum* (Munich, 1901), p. 536, no. 74, p. 592, no. 128, p. 612, no. 20; G. Parthey, *Hieroclis Synecdemus et Notitiae Graecae Episcopatum* (Berlin, 1866, reprinted Amsterdam, 1967), p. 59, no. 75, p. 149, no. 79, p. 153, no. 74, p. 165, no. 79. It survives until an early fourteenth-century list.

12. M. LeQuien, *Oriens Christianus* (Paris, 1740), I, P. 487.

13. Cumont, *B*, VI (1931), 522; V. Laurent, *Le Corpus des Sceaux de l’Empire Byzantin* (Paris, 1963), V (1), pp. 660–1; ‘La localité fut ainsi appelée pour commémorer le séjour que l’empereur Héraclius y fit avec son armée durant l’hiver de 625’.

14. Where in 1461 Sara Hatun pleaded with the Fatih for her son, Uzun Hasan: Tursun Beg, *Tarihi Abul Fatih* (Istanbul, 1921), p. 101.

'Dazimonites, a fertile plain', the modern Kaz Ovasi on the Iris (Yeşil Irmak) west of Dokeia (Tokat).¹⁵ Dazimon, and another evident area name, the 'deep gorge' of Bathys Rhyax, both figure on Constantine Porphyrogenitus' catalogue of *aplekta*.¹⁶ In 1890 Ramsay distinguished the two *aplekta* as areas, allotting Bathys Rhyax to modern Yildizeli (then Yenihan). He was followed by Vasiliev (1902) and Anderson (1903). But by also (and reasonably) arguing that Dazimon and Bathys Rhyax were functionally the same Armeniak *aplekton*, his inference misled Bury (1911), Honigmann (1935) and Canard (1968) to combine the two geographically as well. This had not been Ramsay's intention. Meanwhile Honigmann and Canard scotched an attempt by Tomaschek to move Bathys Rhyax out of the area altogether.¹⁷ Huxley's 1975 edition of the *aplekta* list confirms that Dazimon and Bathys Rhax were indeed distinct assembly points, frequented by the Armeniak themes for different purposes—Bathys Rhyax for a Tephrike (Divriği) campaign (for which the road branches south just before Sebasteia).¹⁸ All Ramsay's arguments for placing Bathys Rhyax in the Yildizeli area still hold good. But although Yildizeli itself stands at the junction of the Sebasteian, Dazimonite and Western highways and boasts a fourteenth-century caravansary and signs of earlier settlement (it is probably the Siara of the *Itineraria*), the town cannot represent the *aplekton* itself, any more than could Herakleioupolis.¹⁹ We propose that the actual gorge of Bathys Rhyax lay east of Yildizeli, and that by riding to Sebasteia, Anderson (among other travellers) unwittingly found himself

15. Strabo, *Geography*, XII, iii, 15; A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes* (Brussels, 1959), p. 148, no. 5; P. Wittek, 'Von der Byzantinischen zur Türkischen Toponymie', *B*, X (1935) 53–9.

16. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Caerimoniis* (CSHB), I, pp. 444–5.

17. Ramsay, *Historical Geography*, pp. 76, 14, 220, 263, 266–7, 326, 328; J. G. C. Anderson, 'A Journey of Exploration in Pontus', *Studia Pontica*, I (Brussels, 1903), 39–40; J. B. Bury, 'The *aplekta* of Asia Minor', *Byzantis*, II (1911), 218; E. Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071* (Brussels, 1935), p. 60 and n. 7; A. A. Vasiliev, ed. M. Canard, *Byzance et les Arabes*, II (I) (Brussels, 1968), p. 36 and n. 2.

18. G. Huxley, 'A list of *aplekta*', *GRBS*, XVI (1975), 87–93.

19. Anderson, *Studia Pontica*, I, pp. 39–40; Cumont, *Studia Pontica*, II, p. 215.

there in 1899: 'From Yeni Khan [i.e. Yildizeli] the road runs along the right bank of the Kalan Su [i.e. Kalinirmak] for an hour and twenty minutes to the edge of the plain, where the river enters a gorge (*boghaz*). Here it crosses to the left bank and, emerging from the defile in half an hour, runs over hilly ground for an hour and twenty minutes to the Yildiz Tchâi' (i.e. Cebilirmak).²⁰ Today the Samsun–Sivas railway has joined the road; of necessity they wriggle along the same route.²¹ The gorge itself is served by a railway station at Menteşe, the centre of the Y of the Cebilirmak and Kalinirmak valleys, 12 km. from Yildizeli, 25 km. from Sebasteia and 33 km. from Herakleioupolis. The sacred Yildiz Dağ is remotely visible.

We propose that Bathys Rhyax is best found by taking a ticket to Menteşe station. We suggest that Heraclius, whatever hand he had in creating the Armeniak theme, at least pioneered its major *aplektion* by wintering in the valleys around it (rather than at Herakleioupolis) in 625, just as he had pioneered the use of the Anatolian entry port of Pylai in 622. And if Bathys Rhyax must be regarded as a descriptive, rather than specific, name, Ramsay's suggestion that it is also the 'cool spring' of Krya Pege is a good one.²² In this case, the last time that a Byzantine army used the Bathys Rhyax valleys came when Romanos IV camped there before moving on to Sebasteia and his defeat at Mantzikert in 1071.

In 872 the Armeniak and Charsianon theme armies caught Chrysocheir and the Paulician forces resting in the Bathys Rhyax. Genesios states that they chased them thirty miles,

20. Anderson, *Studia Pontica*, I, p. 40. Other travellers through the gorge include: J. M. Kinneir, *Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia and Koodistan in the years 1813 and 1814* (London, 1918), pp. 555–6; F. Burnaby, *On Horseback through Asia Minor* (London, 1877), I, pp. 279–80; W. J. C. Childs, *Across Asia Minor on Foot* (London, 1917), p. 141: 'the deep narrow valley of the Yildiz Irmak' (i.e. Cebilirmak), over which travellers habitually noted a handsome ten-arch, apparently Seljuk, bridge.

21. A. Bryer and D. Winfield, 'Nineteenth-century monuments in the city and vilayet of Trebizond, Part 3', *Archeion Pontou*, XXX (1970), 254: 'The first train did not leave Samsun until 1924, only reaching Sivas in 1932 and setting up some sort of record for dilatoriness'.

22. John Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. J. Thurn (Berlin, 1973), p. 691; Ramsay, *Historical Geography*, p. 267.

almost to Sebasteia, to a *bounos* called Constantine.²³ Genesios' geography can be shaky. Our Bathys Rhyax is less than thirty miles from Sebasteia, but there is no obvious hill or mountain there. The most striking one in the region is the Yildiz Dağ of Herakleioupolis, for which we have no Byzantine name. It lies thirty miles away but not in the direction of Sebasteia. There is no obvious solution. But dare one suggest that, if its guardian archbishopric was named after Heraclius, the mountain was named after his son and co-emperor Heraclius the New Constantine (III) (613–641)? Heraclius may perhaps have had a penchant for commemorating his sons; recently Kent suggested that the nine silver 'David Plates' may have been commissioned for the birth of Heraclius' third son, David, and these propositions may not sound so unlikely when the case of Herakleia is considered in Section II.²⁴

II

Where was Heraclius in 626? The case of Herakleia

In 626 Heraclius moved east from around Bathys Rhyax and Herakleioupolis, in the direction of Lazica. He was not fighting the Persians, for they were overlooking Constantinople. Indeed he seems to have been deliberately avoiding them while he recruited his new army, and, apparently finding even that insufficient, was casting around for Khazar allies. The Nikomedeia and Kyzikos mints re-opened briefly. During this time, in no obvious sequence, Martina gave birth to Heraclius (II) (Heraclonas), Heraclius made contact with the Khazars, whose leaders sailed from Lazica to meet him, and in June he seems to have been able to send advice and reinforcements to assist in the great Avar-Persian siege of Constantinople which was lifted on 10 August 626. But Heraclius was not there to rejoice in the deliverance of the City by the Mother of God (and

23. Joseph Genesios, *Regna*, (CSHB), p. 124; P. Lemerle, 'L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques', *Travaux et Mémoires*, V (1973), 98, 100, 103.

24. J. Kent, 'Roman Payola', *Observer Magazine* (27 March 1977), p. 29; cf. *Wealth of the Roman World A.D. 300–700*, ed. J. P. C. Kent and K. S. Painter (London, 1977), pp. 104–12.

Patriarch Sergios). The *Chronicon Paschale* records the most crucial year in the survival of the City. What Heraclius was doing in the Pontos was evidently crucial to the survival of the Empire as well, but on that the *Chronicon* says nothing. One thing is clear: Heraclius regarded his Khazar negotiations as more important than defending his capital in person, but needed a port accessible to both Constantinople and his new allies. Instead of returning to Constantinople, or catching the retiring Persians from behind (as he had in 622), Heraclius then moved into Lazica proper, through the Caucasus, and on to his final campaign against the Persians which ended at the battle of Nineveh in December 627. Heraclius did not return for his triumph in Constantinople until 628 at the earliest.

There is no contemporary, let alone eye-witness, account of his movements in 626. But, with the notable exception of Theophanes (d. 818, who offers a clue to where he had been in 624), all the next generation of chroniclers, Greek, Armenian and Georgian, who treat the campaigns in any detail, retain a definite (if confused) tradition that at some stage Heraclius took ship in the Black Sea. So Baynes proposed shipping him home from the 622 campaign by way of Amisos (Samsun)—for which there is no evidence.²⁵ But a better known port is Trebizond.

25. See n. 7, and on the mints, M. F. Hendy, 'On the administrative basis of the Byzantine coinage c. 400–c. 900 and the reforms of Heraclius', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, XII (1970), 149 and P. D. Whitting, *Byzantine Coins* (London, 1973), p. 132. The Georgian and Armenian chronicles give what appears to be a sequence of information on the Khazar negotiations. The Georgian chronicle has two disconnected passages on Heraclius in the Pontos and at sea. The first (p. 82 in Van Esbroeck's version) is derived from George of Pisidia, but the second (p. 93) comes in passages which 'semblent des sutures rédactionnelles avec quelques détails que nous n'avons pas trouvés ailleurs' (p. 76). This runs in part: 'Cependant le roi Héraclius s'empessa de recruter et de rassembler de tous côtés une expédition, et il recruta un peuple innombrable de combattants, des nombreuses nations de tous côtés et du Pont-Euxin. . . . Il se dirigea avec une multitude innombrable de bateaux, et prit avec lui sa femme, et alla à Trébizonde, aux confins de la Mingrélie. Il eut un fils qu'il appela Héraclius.' The succeeding passage owes something to Nicephorus (see n. 7): 'Et de là il envoya des messagers avec de nombreux présents au roi des Turcs. Or le roi des Turcs reçut largement les envoyés d'Héraclius et lui fit un pacte d'alliance. . . .' The Khazars' return visit in 626 is described by Movsēs Dasxuranci (Kaghankatowats' i): they 'swooped down like eagles upon the great river Kur, and sparing none who came to meet them, made their way

Two sources indeed specify Trebizond, but they are unusual: a Georgian chronicle (probably compiled in 717–860) in which the reference is interpolated, and the Arabic chronicle of Eutychios of Alexandria (d. 940).²⁶ Vasiliev therefore argued that Heraclius not only returned from the 622 campaign by way of Trebizond (for which there is no other evidence, either), but sailed there for his second campaign²⁷ (for which the evidence is against: commonsense, if not Ramsay, dictates that one does not reach Theodosiupolis from Nikomedeia by sailing to Trebizond). Vasiliev went on to propose, confusedly but on firmer grounds, that Heraclius (II) (Heraclonas) was born ‘perhaps at Trebizond, at any rate in Lazica’.²⁸ Stratos made this ‘probably at Trebizond, according to Antiochus the Monk’,²⁹ who regrettably does not mention the birth at all. To Trebizond also, Baynes brought the Khazar chieftains for their audience of Heraclius.³⁰

We suspect that commentators have seized upon Trebizond for the same reason that Eutychios did and for the very reason that argues against Heraclius using it: the place is so well known that if he did, it should not have escaped the notice of even our lame chroniclers. Their geography is vague enough, but Lazica (where they agree that he went at some stage in 626, and indeed was obliged to if he was to reach Tblisi and the inner Caucasus by the end of the year) was as specific an area as Trebizond was a place and, *pace* Vasiliev, Trebizond was not in Lazica. In the

over the lands of Georgia and Egeria [Lazica] and cut across the great sea up to the royal palace. They entered into the presence of the great emperor Heraclius, swore mutual oaths each according to his own law, and received their instructions from him concerning their expedition which no one suspected’: trans. Dowsett, p. 87—the translator is unaccountably against either Heraclius or the Khazars taking ship: see p. 78, n. 4.

26. N. H. Baynes, ‘The military operations of the emperor Heraclius’, Part VI, *The United Service Magazine*, XLVII (1913), 404.

27. A. A. Vasiliev, ‘Notes on the history of Trebizond in the seventh century’, *Eis mnemen Spyridonos Lamprou* (Athens, 1935), 32; cf. Foss, p. 727.

28. Vasiliev, p. 33.

29. A. N. Stratos, trans. M. Ogilvie-Grant, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, I. 602–634 (Amsterdam, 1968), p. 176.

30. Baynes, Part IX, *The United Service Magazine*, XLVII (1913), 666: ‘it is certain that the imperial residence mentioned by our authority was not Constantinople’. See n. 25 above.

early seventh century Lazica was still where Procopius had left it: round the Phasis (Poti).³¹ Later medieval Lazica is a different matter, for old Lazica lost its identity with its monarchy in the next century and, ironically, it was those Laz who were trapped within the tenth-century Byzantine borders who survive today, bringing Lazistan from old Lazica with them in the direction of Trebizond.³²

Putting aside the achievements of saints, later medieval land traffic between Trebizond and Heraclius's Lazica was slow even by Byzantine standards: in the order of 10–14·5 km. a day. From Trebizond to the Phasis would have taken about three weeks to one month through territory which was no longer in Byzantine hands beyond Rhizaion (Rize).³³ So the most obvious (and only) time Heraclius himself need have taken ship would have been in 626 from Byzantine territory to Lazica, the gate to his Caucasian campaign; it would have been a voyage of no more than five days. Parts of his army and its supplies may well, however, have been seaborne from Constantinople in 622 or 623 and the speed with which he could despatch advice and troops to assist Constantinople in 626 implies a sea voyage. The Persians arrived at Chalcedon in early June; Heraclius apparently heard the news and sent reinforcements to the city by 29 June 626.³⁴ Later medieval figures for the Trebizond–Constantinople voyage fall between 5 and 21 days.³⁵

The success of the 622 campaign depended upon Byzantine supply lines penetrating behind the Persians after they had entered Anatolia: in other words, not west through Anatolia and the Persians and the cities they had ravaged, but north to the

31. Procopius, *Wars*, VIII, i, 5–13; ii, 1–33.

32. See A. Bryer, 'Some notes on the Laz and Tzan,' *Bedi Kartlısa*, Part I, XXI–XXII (1966), 174–95; Part II, XXIII–XXIV (1967), 129–36.

33. In 1377 the 203 km. from Makraigialou (Kemalpaşa) to Trebizond was covered in fourteen days; in 1405 the 60 km. from near the 'Cauo d'croxe' (Eski Pazar) to Trebizond was covered in six days. See Od. Lampsidēs, 'Michael tou Panaretou peri ton Megalon Komnenon', *Archeion Pontou*, XXII (1958), 78, and Ruy Gonzales Clavijo, *his embassy from Henry III of Castille to Tamburlaine the Great at Samarkand, 1403–1406*, trans. G. Le Strange (London, 1928), p. 336.

34. That is, if the chronology of F. Barišić is correct: 'Le siège de Constantinople par les Avars et les Slaves en 626', *B*, XXIV (1954), 378, 391.

35. See A. Bryer, 'The Latins in the Euxine', *XVe Congrès International de'Etudes Byzantines*, Rapports et Co-Rapports, I, 3 (Athens, 1976), p. 4.

Pontos, which was one of the few areas which remained unscathed throughout and could offer Heraclius shelter in 625 and 626. The Georgian chronicle makes this clear. But whereas we have looked to the future *aplekta* for where Heraclius wintered in 625, we should look to the sources of the past for where he moved in 626: the vestiges of the old defence system and stations of the *Notitia Dignitatum* reveal still intact supply lines. The most obvious of these is the Trebizond–Satala axis of the old Legio XV Apollinaris. Satala had been strongly refortified in the previous century; the Persians had reached, but do not seem to have taken, it in 608 and it should have been Heraclius’ forward base from his Pontic retreats. But even in later Roman times it was realised that Trebizond does not offer Satala its most direct access to the sea. Its natural port is (Sou-) Sourmaina, 27 km. east of Trebizond and 101 km. nearer Satala over a much more direct route over the Pontic Alps which, by taking the Hyssos (Kara Dere) valley, avoids the dog-leg of the Zigana Pass or Pontic Gates. After the Byzantine borders had shrunk to near Rhizaion, 55 km. east of Sourmaina, by the sixth century, the latter became the most easterly coastal station which gave access to the interior within the Byzantine *limes*. The route flourished again when the Byzantines held Theodosiupolis between the Arab and Seljuk invasions, from 949 to c. 1080, and when rent collectors from the monastery of St. Eugenios in Trebizond preferred to herd their annual supply caravans from Paipertes (Bayburt) to Trebizond *via* Sourmaina and the Hyssos valley, rather than ‘direct’ on what has become the modern road.³⁶ Strategically, the last time when the Sourmaina–Hyssos route to the interior came into its own was during the Russian invasion of 1916, when General Yudenich feared a Turkish attack on his south flank down the Hyssos, and used it for his own on Paipertes.³⁷

36. Otto Seeck, *Notitia Dignitatum accedunt Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae et Laterculi Prouinciarum* (Berlin, 1874) pp. 84–5; Procopius, *Buildings*, III, iv, 2–5; Sebeôs, p. 62 (into which I think Foss, p. 722, reads too hard a fate for Satala); *Studia Pontica*, II pp. 342–51; R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris, 1975), pp. 266–71, 295, 297; T. B. Mitford, ‘Biliotti’s Excavations at Satala,’ *Anatolian Studies*, XXIV (1974), 221–44; its bishopric survived until after 1256: Parthey, op. cit., pp. 37, 64, 108, 187, 207, 249; A. Bryer, ‘Greeks and Türkmens: the Pontic exception,’ *DOP*, XXIX (1975), 139.

37. W. E. D. Allen and P. Muratoff, *Caucasian Battlefields. A History of the Wars on the Turco-Caucasian Border, 1828–1921* (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 380–2, 397–9.

So it is hardly surprising to find abundant evidence for a military station at Sourmaina on the mouth of the Hyssos. There are two related sites. On the coast is a fortress, landing place and walled settlement, the surviving remains of which are later medieval. But the coastal site cannot have escaped earlier use by the second one, which lies just inland, near modern Canayer. This is a classically rectangular walled camp, 200 by 300 metres in size, with four two-storey gates, the upper floor of one of which (which could conceivably have served as a chapel) has an *opus sectile* floor. This heavily overgrown site is smaller than, but has affinities with, both Satala and the great Roman, Byzantine, Georgian and Ottoman rectangular border fortress of Apsaros—?Anakouphe—Gonia, now just within the Soviet border. Apsaros was abandoned by the sixth century, when our camp at Sourmaina would have become the most easterly of the stations listed in the *Notitia Dignitatum* of c. 406–8 still in Byzantine hands. But Justinian chose to refortify Rhizaion (which is less accessible from Satala), rather than Sourmaina, which became a plain *kome*. Whatever happened to Rhizaion or Sourmaina later in the seventh century, they ceased to be important when the border advanced to incorporate Apsaros again by the tenth century.³⁸

The Sourmaina site, or sites, appear under various names. There is Arrian's *Hyssos limen*, a one-cohort place in Trajan's time, which establishment it retained as the *Ysiporto* of the *Notitia Dignitatum*. Elsewhere it is Sourmaina or Sousourmaina (modern Sürmene, always a movable capital of its eponymous district, finally moved from near old Sourmaina to Hamurgân, 10 km. to the east, within the last century).³⁹ Sourmaina camp may have even been blessed with the blood of a military martyr.

Reluctantly, for they trail a host of problems in their wake, we must introduce at this point a shadowy band of Seven Brothers

38. The Sourmaina site will be published, and the history of the Apsaros site discussed, in the authors' forthcoming Dumbarton Oaks Study on *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos*. See Procopius, *Buildings*, III, vii, 3–4; *Wars*, VIII, ii, 3, 14; F. Uspenskii, 'Starinnaia kriepest' na ust' ie Chorokha', *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences*, VIe série, XI (Petrograd, February 1917), 163–9; and V. A. Lekvinadze, 'Material 'i po istorii i arkhitekture Apsarskoi kreposti', *VV, XX* (1961), 225–42.

39. See n. 36 above, and A. Baschmakoff, *La synthèse des périples pontiques* (Paris, 1948), pp. 82–7, 124–5; Procopius, *Wars*, VIII, ii, 16; and K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana* (Stuttgart, 1916), col. 648.

of Lazica, as they struggle up from Satala to their respective martyrdoms on the coast, at the orders of Diocletian's implacable governor. They are the sort of martyrs whom even St. Athenogenes of Pedachthoe and his deer might have disowned. But in fact they belong to an apparently related series of four Pontic Group Passions with Satalan connections, which we will examine elsewhere. Briefly, the series begins respectably enough with the fourth-century Passion, Testament and cult of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia. Their vast fame evidently engendered the Passion, Testament and cult of the Five Saints of Arauraka (Avarak, or perhaps Aşağı Akçalı), the most junior of whom, St. Eugenios, seems to have been promoted as the leader of the Four Saints of Trebizond. This process of what might be termed hagiological kidnapping took place by 407–c. 550. (The earlier date is that of St. John Chrysostom's exile to Pityous [Pitsunda], which did for that obscure place what the Prince Regent did for Brighton, so that St. Eugenios of Trebizond—but not Arauraka—was fashionably exiled there and one of the Seven Brothers met his end there; the later date is that of the first attestation of St. Eugenios' cult in Trebizond.) The Seven of Lazica belong to the same family as the Four of Trebizond and Five of Arauraka, but it is difficult to establish their precise hagiographical parentage; probably they are the most junior. Nor surprisingly, Peeters despaired of their tale as a rather unimaginative Greek fabrication. The names of our little army of martyrs (Phirmos, Phirminos, etc.) are reminiscent of those of a hard-pressed novelist who has run out of plausible ones for his characters, and Peeters regarded the fact that he could find no evidence of their subsequent cult particularly damning. But evidence for the cult of the leading martyr has since appeared unexpectedly in an Ottoman document, so we must take the Seven Brothers more seriously. Significantly they did not reach the coast from Satala at Trebizond or even Rhizaion, but at a *Kaine Paremböle* between the two. Here St. Eros [*sic*], the first brother, was killed on 22 June. St. Orentios, the leading brother, next met his end at Rhizaion, where he was buried, on 24 June. The day (also the Baptist's feast) is significant, for in the late ninth century the principal feast of St. Eugenios was switched from 21 January to 24 June. The latter date was surely more convenient for the caravans from the lands

of St. Eugenios which fed its *panegyris* in Trebizond, *via* Sourmaina, for the Hyssos passes are blocked in January, but one suspects that the move was also to pre-empt, or cash in on, the Rhizaion fair on the way. Similarly, St. Eugenios of Trebizond triumphed over his namesake of Arauraka in the eleventh century, through the energetic propaganda of John Xiphilinos and when the Turks destroyed the cult centre at Arauraka so thoroughly that its very site is in dispute. But St. Eugenios evidently did not destroy the cult of his rival at Rhizaion too, for a late fifteenth-century *defter* records the existence of a monastery of St. Orentios ('Ayo-Randos') there, which gives some sort of substance to the story.

The dwindling band of brothers continued to work eastwards, like the proverbial ten little Indians. Sometimes they set up travel records. One by one they met their ends (and provided individual patrons for) stations along the coast until the last, St. Longinos, was washed up at Pityous one 28 July—coincidentally the day of the lunar eclipse of 622. It seems likely therefore, that the author of the tale (Peeters refused to call it hagiography) intended Sourmaina for the 'New Encampment' where St. Eros was martyred, and that the Seven Brothers came up from Satala along supply lines which Heraclius may have used. The periplus of Byzantine coastal stations in the tale should reflect the days of the *Notitia Dignitatum* when they still stretched up to Pityous and old Lazica, and a similar ghost catalogue lurks in versions of the wanderings of St. Andrew, but at what stage would Sourmaina have become a 'new' encampment? Sourmaina had become a *kome*, not a *parembole*, by the sixth century: was its encampment subsequently rebuilt as 'new'?⁴⁰

40. AASS, June, IV (Antwerp, 1707), pp. 809–11; June, V (Paris–Rome, 1867), pp. 694–6; *Synaxarium CP*, p. 767; cf. St. Andrew's supposed visit to the place in MPG, CXX, 241; Procopius, *Buildings*, III, vii, 1; [Peeters], 'La légende de S. Orentius et de ses six frères martyrs', AB, LVI (1938), 241–64; M. T. Gökbilgin, 'XVI, yüzyıl başlarında Trabzon livası ve doğu Karadeniz bölgesi', BTTK, XXVI (1962), p. 321 (on 'Ayo-Randos'). The problem is complicated by the fact that the *Notitia Dignitatum* lists both as Ysiporto and a Caene Parembole (see n. 36 above). So Apsaros could be either Ualentia or the *parembole*—cf. C. Frick, *Chronica Minora* (Leipzig, 1892), I, p. 216. Our 'hagiography' is more likely to be at fault than the *Notitia*. The whole question of the interrelation of the Pontic Group Passions is explored in Winfield and Bryer's forthcoming study.

If Heraclius had any strategic sense, he would have used Sourmaina (rather than Trebizond) in 626, and perhaps for his supplies in 622 and 623. But that is hardly proof that he did so. What makes the proposition more than a bright idea, however, is that the camp and associated castle at Sourmaina takes on yet another name after the sixth century: *Ἡράκλεια*. Herakleia, today the village of Arakli or Erikli, 1 km. from our encampment, was a *chorion* of the monastery of the Pharos in 1432.⁴¹ The names for the associated coastal castle, cape and landing place remain Arakli Burunu (Kale) and Arakliçarşisi. Unlike Herakleioupolis, Herakleia was a good military base. But in both cases an earlier, local, name survived side by side with the new one.

We suggest that Heraclius was at this Herakleia (which he may even have rebuilt) in 626, that from it he simultaneously maintained contact with Constantinople and established contact with the Khazar chieftains who sailed there from Lazica, and that it was from Herakleia that he sailed in turn to Lazica later in the year. We further propose that Sourmaina was not renamed Herakleia because of Heraclius himself, but after Heraclius (II), (Heraclonas), whose birthplace it would have been. The younger Heraclius was to enjoy a reign of only a few months in 641 before he and his mother Martina were mutilated. And while recent scholarship suggests that it is not, after all, the siege of 626 which the second *Prooemion* of the *Akathistos* hymn celebrates, the Turks of Arakli may well be unwittingly commemorating to this day the lesser event of the year.⁴²

III

Was Heracliana civitas founded in honour of Heraclius?

It is commonly accepted that the Venetian city of Heraclea or *Civitas Nova* was founded either on the orders of or in honour of Heraclius, and that after the sack of Oderzo in around 639 it received a large influx of refugees and became the residence of

41. V. Laurent, 'Deux chrysobulles inédits des empereurs de Trébizonde Alexis IV—Jean IV et David II', *Archeion Pontou*, XVIII (1953), 264.

42. E. Wellesz, 'The "Akathistos." A study in byzantine hymnography', *DOP*, IX–X (1956), 152.

the governor (*magister militum*) of the Byzantine province of Venetia, a status which it retained until the *dux* Deusdedit moved his seat to Malamocco around 740.⁴³ This view is derived from the Venetian chronicle tradition, in which the city played an important role. The early chronicles also portray it as the scene of the first election of a *dux* and record a treaty supposedly made by the successful candidate Paulicius with the Lombard King Liutprand which defined the boundaries of the *territoria* of *Civitas Nova* and Oderzo. Both these episodes demonstrate the caution which is necessary in the use of Venetian chronicles. The tradition which they represent antedates to the end of the seventh century the first popular election of a *dux*, which in fact occurred during the revolt against the iconoclast decrees in 727, and wrongly identify Paulicius as the first elected *dux*, an honour which should probably be assigned to Ursus. It has been persuasively argued that the chroniclers' accounts of Paulicius' career and that of the treaty with Liutprand have no independent value but are derived solely from a document of 840, the *Pactum Hlotharii*, which confirmed the earlier agreement.⁴⁴ From the eighth century *Civitas Nova* went into

43. See most recently G. Schmiedt, 'Città scomparse e città di nuova fondazione in Italia in relazione al sistema di comunicazione', *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo*, XXI, ii (Spoleto, 1974), 526–7, and A. Pertusi, 'L'iscrizione torcellana dei tempi di Eraclio', *ZRVI*, VIII, ii (1964), 315–39 (a virtually identical article with the same title appeared in *Bollettino dell' Istituto di Storia della Società e dello Stato*, IV [1962], 9–38). Cf. R. Cessi, 'Da Roma a Bisanzio,' in *Storia di Venezia*, I (Venice, 1957), 381–5, who wrongly implies that the name Heracliana appears in the Torcello inscription.

44. The Venetian chroniclers misinterpreted an agreement made between Paulicius and a *magister militum* named Marcellus in the time of King Liutprand (712–44) as a treaty concluded with the Lombard King. See R. Cessi, 'Paulicius dux,' *Le origini del ducato veneziano* (Naples, 1951), pp. 155–73, who identified the ducal election with that recorded in *Le Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, I, 404, and identified Paulicius with the exarch Paul (c. 723–c. 727). Since the treaty was signed between Paulicius and a Byzantine official, the *magister militum*, it makes better sense to see the former as a Lombard, possibly an otherwise unknown duke of Treviso. *Pactum Hlotharii: Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (hereafter *MGH*), *Capitularia regum Francorum*, II, ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause (Hanover, 1897), 135. The definition of the boundaries of *Civitas Nova* was later confirmed by the Lombard King Aistulf (749–756): *Codice Diplomatico Longobardo*, III, i, ed. C. Brühl, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, LXIV (Rome, 1973), 312 (who wrongly saw the lost document as the confirmation of a donation).

decline as a result of internal strife and Frankish and Hungarian attacks, although its bishopric was not finally suppressed until 1440.⁴⁵ It owed its early importance to its secure position on a sand dune (*insula*) cut off by canals from the mainland near the mouths of the River Piave.⁴⁶

If the name Heraclea or *Heraciana civitas* can be proved to be contemporary, it would afford interesting evidence of the practical impact of imperial authority in a poorly-documented area at a time when Byzantine power was being undermined by internal unrest and Lombard aggression. Although we have noted that the grant of imperial names to mark the founding or re-founding of cities was a common practice in the Eastern Roman Empire, cases in the West were extremely rare.⁴⁷ In Italy many new settlements and *castra* emerge in the Byzantine period (535–751), largely for defensive purposes, but the precise role of the imperial authorities in their foundation is far from clear. The centres whose origins are most clearly attributable to the Byzantine period do not bear imperial names, and early evidence is uniformly lacking about the setting up of those settlements whose names suggest association with an emperor.⁴⁸ For example the suggestion that Porto Maurizio near Imperia in Liguria was so named in order to commemorate the Emperor Maurice is hard to reconcile with its absence in two invaluable geographical works datable to the seventh century, the list attributed to George of Cyprus and the Anonymous Cosmography of Ravenna.⁴⁹ Serious objections also apply to two examples in the Upper Adriatic, Justinopolis (Capodistria), associated with Justin II, and Constanziaco in the diocese of

45. P. Kehr, *Italia Pontifica*, VII, ii (Berlin, 1925), 78; idem, 'Rom und Venedig bis ins XII. Jahrhundert,' *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XIX (1927), 31–4.

46. Schmiedt, loc. cit., and plates V and VI.

47. See n. 1 above.

48. Schmiedt, art. cit., 503–607. Two prominent new foundations are Argenta and Ferrara, whose fortification tradition ascribed to the exarch Smaragdus: G. Rossi, *Historiarum Ravennatum libri XI* (Venice, 1591), p. 192.

49. N. Lamboglia, 'Topografia storica dell' Ingaunia nell' antichità,' *Collana storico-archeologica di Liguria occidentale*, II, no. 4 (1953), 77–8; idem, *Liguria Romana* (Alassio, 1939), p. 160; *Le Synekdemōs de Hiérôklès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre*, ed. E. Honigsmann (Brussels, 1935); *Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia*, ed. J. Schnez, *Itineraria Romana*, II (Leipzig, 1940).

Torcello, supposedly named after Constans II. In the source closest to Justin's reign, the letters of Pope Gregory the Great (590–604), Capodistria is called not Justinopolis but *insula Capritana*, and the former name does not appear in contemporary documents until the tenth century.⁵⁰ The association of Constanziaco with a Byzantine emperor is derived from the fourteenth-century chronicler Andrea Dandolo, who gives ground for doubt by his earlier statement that the place had been settled by refugees from Altinum during the Hun invasions of the fifth century.⁵¹

The case of *Civitas Nova* is also doubtful, because no early source records the city's name as Heraclea. The most valuable contemporary source, a dedicatory inscription of 639 found in the wall of the presbytery of the church of S. Maria Assunta in Torcello in 1895, does not mention Heraclea, and Pertusi has shown that there are no grounds for Cessi's belief that the inscription was transferred from a church in the mainland city.⁵² The bishop of *Civitas Nova* subscribed to the acts of the Roman Council of 680 as the bishop of Oderzo, but it must be admitted that this former title was still being used by the bishops of Heraclea centuries later.⁵³

The treaties signed between Frankish rulers and Venice in the ninth century are unanimous in naming the city as *Civitas Nova*, and in the tenth century Constantine Porphyrogenitus makes no

50. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia*, VII, ii, 214–15. The inscriptions purporting to record the foundation of the city (*CIL*, V. 12, 13) are forgeries.

51. Dandolo, *Chronicon*, VI.8.1, V.5.3, ed. E. Pastorello, in L. A. Muratori, ed. *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, new ser., XII, i (Bologna, 1938), 98, 59. Constans II was generally called *Constantinus* in official documents. The suggestion made by Pastorello, *ibid.*, p. 98, note, that the place was named after Constans I (337–50), is unlikely.

52. Pertusi, *art. cit.*; Cessi, *Le origini*, pp. 33–6; *idem* 'Alcuni osservazioni sulla basilica di S. Maria di Torcello . . .', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, CXIX (1961), 665–74.

53. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova Collectio*, XI (Florence, 1765), col. 311; Kehr, *Italia Pontificia*, VII, ii, 78; *idem*, 'Rom und Venedig,' p. 32. On the circumstances in which a new bishopric was founded at Ceneda on the mainland in place of the destroyed see of Oderzo while the nominal *episcopus Opiterginae civitatis* was 'lurking on a certain island' (*latitans in quadam insula*—i.e. *Civitas Nova*), see R. Cessi, 'La crisi ecclesiastica veneziana al tempo del duca Orso,' *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, LXXXVII, ii (1927–8), 829–30, discussing a forged document of King Liutprand.

mention of Heraclius in connection with the old ducal capital, which he calls *Τζιβιτάνουβα*. It is particularly significant that a ninth-century document from Venice itself, the testament of the doge Iustinianus Particiacus (d. 829) refers to lands in the area of *Civitas Nova*, and not *Heraclea*.⁵⁴

The earliest sources to use the imperial name are two diplomata of 995 and 999 in which Otto III confirmed the rights of the doge over *civitas nova quae vocatur Heracliana*.⁵⁵ The tradition that the city was named in honour of Heraclius is first expressed in local chronicles, the earliest of which was composed by John the Deacon in the early eleventh century. John relates that *Eracliana* was built on a lavish scale (*magnopere*) in the reign of Heraclius and then decayed through age (*vetustate consumpta*). It was then rebuilt on a smaller scale and the bishop of Oderzo made it his residence after his seat was captured by the Lombards.⁵⁶ Pertusi believed that this tradition 'rested on a solid foundation', and explained the curious name by suggesting that the first foundation of Heracliana was renamed *Civitas Nova* when it was repopulated.⁵⁷ However John's telescoping of a period of decay to a maximum of thirty years (Heraclius became Emperor in 610) gives grounds for suspicion that he was rationalizing a vaguer tradition in ignorance of the precise chronology of the period. The *Chronicon Gradense* and the *Chronicon Altinate* record the settlement of *civitas nova quae Eracliana appellata (nuncupata) est* with refugees in Heraclius' reign, but they confuse the issue by associating the city's foundation with Patriarch Helias of Aquileia (571–86).⁵⁸ Andrea

54. *MGH, Capitularia*, II, 131, 135 (840), *MGH, Diplomata regum Germaniae ex stirpe Karolinorum*, II, ed. P. Kehr (Berlin, 1935), 27, 30, (880), 126 (883); Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, chap. 28, ed. Gy. Moravcsik, *Dumbarton Oaks Texts*, (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 121; *Documenti relativi alla storia di Venezia anteriori al Mille*, ed. R. Cessi, I (Padua, 1942), 95, no. 53.

55. *MGH, Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, II (2nd ed., Berlin, 1956), 578, 734. Documents of Otto I and Otto II used only the name *civitas nova*: *ibid.*, I, 480, 482 (967), II, 355 (983).

56. Ed. G. Monticolo, *Cronache veneziane antichissime*, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, IX (Rome, 1890), 64. On the dates of the early chronicles see G. Fasoli, 'I fondamenti della storiografia veneziana,' in *La storiografia veneziana fino al secolo XVI*, ed. A. Pertusi (Florence, 1970), pp. 11–44.

57. Pertusi, *art. cit.*, pp. 332–3; and n. 58.

58. *Chronicon Gradense*, ed. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, pp. 44–6; *Chronicon Altinate*,

Dandolo ascribed the city's foundation to the legendary bishop St. Magnus, who named it after Heraclius, and associated the name *Civitas Nova* with the restoration of the city by the doge Agnellus in the early ninth century.⁵⁹

The weight of the evidence therefore suggests that the city originally bore the simple name of *Civitas Nova* and that the tradition of its naming after Heraclius only grew up later. In 1927 Cessi argued that the tradition had developed shortly before the Ottonian period as a reflection of 'il perdurare del sentimento di Bizantinismo'.⁶⁰ Certainly the Venetians felt a close attachment to their imperial suzerain in the ninth century, partly for economic reasons and partly because of the Frankish threat, and a natural step would have been to associate the old capital with an emperor whose memory remained alive, as is clear from the later chronicles. By the time of John the Deacon a tradition had grown up that Heraclius had sent the cathedra of St. Mark, the city's patron, as a gift to the cathedral of Grado.⁶¹ The tradition may have been promoted by the obscure internal disputes at the time, since the faction based on *Civitas Nova* may have wished to add to the authority of its stronghold. It is possible that the change of name should be seen in the context of a widespread fashion for things Byzantine, which is also reflected in Venetian leaders' fondness for imperial titles and which a scholar writing of an analogous phenomenon in Rome has neatly characterized as 'le snobisme byzantinisant'.⁶² This attitude can also be seen in the growth of legends surrounding the sixth-century general Narses, who enjoyed posthumous fame in Venetian chronicles as the benefactor of an independent

ed. R. Cessi, *Origo civitatum Italiae seu Venetiarum, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, LXXII (Rome, 1933), 154.

59. Dandolo, VI.7.10, VIII.1.14, ed. cit., pp. 95, 141.

60. R. Cessi, *Venezia ducale*, I (Padua, 1927), 65, 237–8.

61. K. Weitzmann, 'The Ivories of the So-called Grado Chair', *DOP* XXVI (1972), 51–8.

62. P. Toubert, *Les structures du Latium médiéval* (Rome, 1973), I, p. 655, n. 1. On the acquisition of Byzantine dignities by Venetian *duces* and their imitation of imperial models, see A. Pertusi, 'Quaedam regalia insignia', *Studi Scritti di paleografia e diplomatica* (2nd ed., Padua, 1969), pp. 195–200, and R. Cessi, 'Bizantinismo veneziano,' *Archivio Veneto*, 5th series, LXIX (1961), 3–22.

Venice, as well as in the common adoption of the name of Narses' master, Justinian.⁶³

The change may also be associated with a growing sense of identity among the leading Venetian families. The *Chronicon Gradense* emphasizes the settlement of *Civitas Nova* by *nobiles*, and Dandolo gives a list of the prominent families, including his own, which claimed to have migrated from the city to Rialto. A more mundane, but probably important, factor, may have been the existing confusion with a second *Civitas Nova*, Novigrad in Istria.⁶⁴

The political conditions in Northern Italy in Heraclius' reign make it not unlikely that *Civitas Nova* was founded at that time, and the tradition that the city attracted many refugees from Oderzo around 639 appears well-founded. However there are grounds for believing that the city did not become the capital of Venetia until around 669, when Oderzo was finally razed to the ground by the Lombard king Grimoald.⁶⁵ The inscription of 639 records the *magister militum* as resident not in *Civitas Nova* but in Torcello, and a Byzantine official, the *patricius* Gregory, was based in Oderzo shortly before its final sack.⁶⁶ This argues against the hypothesis that the initiative for the new foundation came from Heraclius himself,⁶⁷ since an emperor would have been likely to have conferred superior political status on a city founded to perpetuate his memory. In reality, the absence of early references to the name Heraclea suggests that the city was not renamed in the Emperor's honour until centuries after his death.

The foundation of 'Heraclea' has naturally been seen as

63. Ibid., p. 10.

64. *Chronicon Gradense*, ed. cit., pp. 45–46; Dandolo, VII.14.11, ed. cit., p. 129. On Dandolo's attitude to the noble migration from Heraclea, G. Arnaldi, 'Andrea Dandolo, doge-cronista', in *La storiografia*, cit., p. 190, n. 2, p. 252. The indices in the *MGH Capitularia* and *Diplomata* volumes make no distinction between the Venetian *Civitas Nova*, its Istrian namesake and another place of the same name near Modena.

65. Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, V. 28, ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, *MGH, Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum* (Hanover, 1878), p. 153.

66. Ibid., IV.45, p. 135. Dandolo, VI.8.17, ed. cit., p. 99, records a major influx of settlers into *Civitas Nova* at the time of the second sack of Oderzo.

67. Advanced by Pertusi, art. cit., p. 353, who also suggested that Heraclius contributed financially to the new city.

central to the complex issue of Heraclius' impact in the West. Here the historian faces problems even more daunting than those surrounding the Emperor's activities in the East. The chief difficulty is posed by the reticence of the sources; the only major contemporary source from Italy has only five references to the Emperor, all of them brief, and the western source which has most to say about Heraclius, the Burgundian chronicle attributed to 'Fredegar', portrays him as a larger-than-life legendary figure who consults astrologers and engages in personal combat with the champion of the King of the Persians.⁶⁸ It can be argued that Heraclius' reign marks a turning-point in the Empire's relations with its Italian possessions, since his reign saw in 616 and 619 the first serious revolts by army units which were becoming increasingly local in character and coincided with Avar, Persian and Arab onslaughts of such a seriousness that little time or resources could be spared for the distant West.⁶⁹ On the other hand, Heraclius was responsible for the appointment of perhaps the most effective and able of the exarchs to govern Italy, Isaac (625–643), and was closely involved in seeking acceptance in the West of the compromise doctrines of a single energy and a single will of Christ intended to achieve religious unity within the Empire.⁷⁰ All that can reasonably be said is that Heraclius' interest in Italy varied during the course of his long reign in accordance with the pressure of preoccupations closer to home, and that central

68. *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. cit., pp. 321, 323, 328, 329; the only other contemporary Italian source, the continuation of the *Consularia Italica* known as the *Auctarii Havniensis Extrema* has only three references to Heraclius: ed. T. Mommsen, *MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi*, IX (Berlin, 1892), 339, cc. 18, 20, 21. On Fredegar, P. Lemerle, 'Les répercussions de la crise de l'empire d'Orient au VII^e siècle sur les pays d'Occident', *Settimane* cit., V, ii (Spoleto, 1958), 730.

69. On these revolts and Italian separatism in general, A. Guillou, *Régionalisme et indépendance dans l'empire byzantin au VII^e siècle: l'exemple de l'Exarchat et de la Pentapole d'Italie* (Rome, 1969), pp. 204–6.

70. Isaac: O. Bertolini, 'Il patrizio Isacio esarco d'Italia', *Scritti scelti di storia medievale* (Livorno, 1968), I, pp. 65–8. Theological negotiations with Rome: idem, 'Riflessi politici delle controversie religiose con Bisanzio nelle vicende del secolo VII in Italia', *Settimane* cit., V, ii, 754–7; P. A. B. Llewellyn, 'The Roman Church in the Seventh Century: the Legacy of Gregory I', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XXV (1974), 371–5. Heraclius had sufficient interest in the West to consider moving his capital to Carthage in a period of crisis: Nicephorus, *Historia Syntomos*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1880), p. 12.

intervention was never sufficiently sustained to reverse the powerful forces working towards separatism. While closer study of the nature of imperial government in Italy may allow a more precise assessment, there is nothing to be gained by drawing conclusions about the strength of imperial loyalties from the foundation of a city whose only association with Heraclius may have been a product of tenth-century antiquarianism.

*Universities of Birmingham and Oxford
and Dumbarton Oaks*